REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Advisory Action mailed February 5, 2008, and is supplemental to the Response Under 37 CFR 1.116 filed January 14, 2008 in response to the Final Office Action mailed November 14, 2007. Claims 1, 8-11, 15, 21, and 25-27 have been amended. New dependent claims 28-32 have been added. Claims 2-5 have been canceled by way of this amendment. As a result, claims 1, 6-11, 15, 17, and 21-32 are now pending in this application.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicants' remarks concerning the claims will be presented in the same order in which the Examiner presented them in the Office Action.

Amendments to Claims 1, 8-11, 15, 21, and 25-27

Claims 1, 8-11, 15, 21, and 25-27 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Independent claims 1 and 25 have been amended by reciting the generation of first and second router packets from first and second function packets, respectively, wherein the first and second function packets are of first and second lengths, the second function packet length being different from the first function packet length. Support for this language may be found, for example, on page 10, lines 7-9, and on page 13, lines 27-29.

Independent claims 15 and 21 have been amended by reciting that the function packet has a variable length, and that the function packet comprises function packet data.

New Claims 28-32

New dependent claims 28-32 have been added to provide Applicants with additional protection to which Applicants are entitled. New claims 28-32 are supported by the original disclosure. No new matter has been introduced.

New claim 28 recites that the first function packet segment includes first function data. Support may be found in original claim 2.

New claim 29 recites that the first and second function packet segments include first and second function data, respectively. Support may be found in original claim 2.

New claim 30 recites that the first and second routers are one and the same. Support may be found in FIG. 7 and its corresponding written description.

New claim 31 recites that the first router packet data length is relatively short, corresponding to a relatively slow rate function. Support may be found on page 6, lines 19-23.

New claim 32 recites that the second router packet data length is relatively long, corresponding to a relatively fast rate function. Support may be found on page 6, lines 23-27.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 9-11, and 25-27 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as Anticipated by Petersen

Claims 1-5, 9-11, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Petersen et al. (U.S. 5,802,051). As mentioned earlier, claims 2-5 have been canceled.

The rule under 35 U.S.C. §102 is well settled that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2D 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP §2131.

Petersen does not disclose all of the structural elements recited in independent claims 1 and 25. For example, Petersen does not disclose *inter alia*:

> receiving a second function packet, including a second function packet header and a second function packet segment, from a second function packet source, wherein the second function packet header indicates a second function packet length, different from the first function packet length, and a second router packet data length, wherein the second router packet data length is determined from pre-stored second router packet length information relating to a second function [emphasis added]

For the above reasons, independent claims 1 and 25 should be found to be allowable over Petersen, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Petersen be withdrawn.

Claims 9-11, which depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above. Likewise, newly submitted claims 28-32, which are also dependent upon claim 1, should be allowable.

Claims 26 and 27, which depend from claim 25 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above.

Rejection of Claims 6-8, 15, 17, and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)
As Unpatentable over Petersen in view of Blasbalg

Claims 6-8, 15, 17, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen et al. in view of Blasbalg (U.S. 4,771,391).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA, 1974). MPEP §2143.

Neither Petersen nor Blasbalg discloses all of the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 15, and 21.

Regarding independent claim 1, neither Petersen nor Blasbalg discloses *inter alia*:

> receiving a second function packet, including a second function packet header and a second function packet segment, from a second function packet source, wherein the second function packet header indicates a second function packet length, different from the first function packet length, and a second router packet data length, wherein the second router packet data length is determined from pre-stored second router packet length information relating to a second function [emphasis added];

Regarding independent claim 15, neither Petersen nor Blasbalg discloses *inter alia*

> a source adaptor generating a set of associated router packets from a function packet received from a function packet source, wherein the function packet has a variable length [emphasis added]

Regarding independent claim 21, neither Petersen nor Blasbalg discloses *inter alia*:

> at least one adaptor, operably connected to a router, which is operable to generate a set of associated router packets from a function packet received from a function packet

> source, wherein the function packet has a variable length, wherein the function packet comprises function packet data, and wherein each router packet has a router packet data length that is less than or equal to a function packet length, and to send the set of associated router packets to a router [emphasis added]

Neither Petersen nor Blasbalg discloses packet-switching systems or methods in which both function packets and router packets are of variable length. Applicants' inventive subject matter provides greater adaptability to latency and/or system bandwidth issues than either Petersen or Blasbalg, or any suggested combination thereof.

For the above reasons, independent claims 1, 15, and 21 should be found to be allowable over any combination of Petersen and Blasbalg, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 15, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Petersen in view of Blasbalg be withdrawn.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. MPEP §2143.03.

Claims 6-8, 17, and 22-24, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 15, and 21, and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above.

Additional Elements and Limitations

Applicants consider additional elements and limitations of the claims to further distinguish over the cited references, and Applicants reserve the right to present arguments to this effect at a later date.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6-11, 15, 17, and 21-32 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney, Ann M. McCrackin (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) at (612) 349-9592 or Applicants' below-signed attorney (located in Phoenix, Arizona) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(602) 298-8920

By / Walter W. Nielsen /
Walter W. Nielsen
Reg. No. 25,539